arXiv:1206.3649v2 [math.OC] 25 Jul 2012

A GENERAL MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR OPTIMAL CONTROL OF STOCHASTIC EVOLUTION EQUATIONS

KAI DU* AND QINGXIN MENG†

Abstract. A stochastic maximum principle is proved for optimal controls of semilinear stochastic evolution equations in the general case. Stochastic evolution operators, and the control with values in a general set enter into both drift and diffusion terms.

Key words. Maximum principle, stochastic evolution equation, L^p estimate, stochastic bilinear functional, operator-valued stochastic process.

AMS subject classification. 49K27, 93E20, 60H25.

1. Introduction. In this paper, we study an infinite dimensional stochastic optimal problem whose purpose is to minimize a cost functional

$$J(u) = \mathbf{E}\int_0^1 l(t, x(t), u(t))\,\mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{E}h(x(1))$$

subject to the semilinear stochastic evolution equation (SEE)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}x(t) &= [A(t)x(t) + f(t, x(t), u(t))]\mathrm{d}t + [B(t)x(t) + g(t, x(t), u(t))]\,\mathrm{d}W_t, \\ x(0) &= x_0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

with the control variable u valued in a subset U of a metric space. Here the state variable x takes values in a separable Hilbert space H, A and B are both stochastic evolution operators, f and g are given H-valued functions, l and h are nonlinear functionals, and W is a 1-dimensional standard Wiener process[1].

The research on the Pontryagin maximum principle for infinite-dimensional *nonlinear* stochastic evolution systems has developed for a long time. All existing publications considered only the case that the control does not appear in the diffusion term (see [1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 17, 18] etc.). Very recently, there are three preprints [7, 8, 12] concerning the case that the control appears in the diffusion term. Both the works [12, 8] discuss a simple form of system (1.1) with A being an infinitesimal generator of a strongly continuous semigroup and $B = 0$. In our previous work [7], a maximum principle is proved under the same setting as in the present paper, but the characterization of the second-order adjoint process was indirect. In this paper, we give a direct and clear characterization of the 2nd-order adjoint process and establish a complete formulation of stochastic maximum principle for the optimal control in the general case that stochastic evolution operators, as well as the control variable with values in a general set, enter into both drift and diffusion terms of the state equation.

A basic idea of establishing the general maximum principle for stochastic optimal control follows from a well-known work [14] which solved the finite-dimensional case. The main difficulties in our problem are (i) the L^p-estimate for SEEs, and (ii) the

---

*Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland (kai.du@math.ethz.ch); School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

†Department of Mathematical Sciences, Huzhou University, Zhejiang 313000, China (mqx@hutc.zj.cn); School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

[1] This restriction is only for convenience. The approaches and results in this paper can be extended without any nontrivial difficulty to the system driving by a multi-dimensional Wiener process.

second-order duality analysis (in other words, the characterization of the second-order adjoint process). To get over the former, we first introduce a structural condition on the operator B (Assumption 2.3), which is refined from many applications. For the second, a classical method is to characterize the second-order adjoint process by an operator-valued BSDEs. This, working well for the finite-dimensional case, meets a big problem for the infinite-dimensional case, because the required solvability result of infinite-dimensional operator-valued BSDEs is unknown so far. Our approach of overcoming the second difficulty is novel. By utilizing the Lebesgue differential theorem at an early step of the second-order duality analysis (Lemma 5.4), we simplify the problem into characterizing the limit of a class of bilinear functionals on H-valued random variables (for more explanations, see Remark 5.5). We show that this limit is associated with a stochastic bilinear functional (Proposition 4.1) which can be represented by an operator-valued stochastic process (Theorem 2.6). The last thing is exactly the desired *second-order adjoint process*.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state the problem and our main results. In Section 3, the basic L^p-estimate for SEEs is derived. In Section 4, we study the representation and properties of a stochastic bilinear functional, and finally in Section 5, we derive the stochastic maximum principle.

2. Formulation and main results.

2.1. Notations and statement of the problem. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbf{P})$ be a filtered probability space where the filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is generated by a 1-dimensional standard Wiener process $W = \{W_t; t \geq 0\}$ and satisfies the usual conditions.

Let H and V be two separable real Hilbert spaces such that V is densely embedded in H. We identify H with its dual space, and denote by V^* the dual of V. Then we have $V \subset H \subset V^*$. Denote by $\|\cdot\|_H$ the norms of H, by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the inner product in H, and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_*$ the duality product between V and V^*. Denote by $\mathfrak{B}(X \to Y)$ the Banach space of all bounded linear operators from Banach space X to Banach space Y, with the norm $\|T\| := \sup\{\|Tx\|_Y; \|x\|_X = 1\}$. Simply, denote $\mathfrak{B}(X) = \mathfrak{B}(X \to X)$. For a σ-algebra $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$, denote by $L^2_w(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathfrak{B}(H))$ the space of all essentially $\mathfrak{B}(H)$-valued weakly $\mathcal{G}$-measurable random variables P satisfying $\mathbf{E}\|P\|^2_{\mathfrak{B}(H)} < \infty$.

Now recall the controlled stochastic evolution system (1.1)

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{d}x(t) = [A(t)x(t) + f(t, x(t), u(t))]\mathrm{d}t + [B(t)x(t) + g(t, x(t), u(t))]\,\mathrm{d}W_t, \\ &x(0) = x_0 \end{aligned}$$

with the control process $u(\cdot)$ valued in a set U, given stochastic evolution operators

$$A : [0, 1] \times \Omega \to \mathfrak{B}(V \to V^*) \quad \text{and} \quad B : [0, 1] \times \Omega \to \mathfrak{B}(V \to H),$$

and nonlinear terms

$$f,\, g : [0, 1] \times H \times U \times \Omega \to H.$$

Here the *control set* U is a nonempty Borel-measurable subset of a metric space whose metric is denoted by $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$. Fix an element (denoted by 0) in U, and then define $|u|_U = \mathrm{dist}(u, 0)$. An *admissible control* $u(\cdot)$ is a U-valued $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbf{E}\,|u(t)|^4_U < \infty.$$

Denote by U_{ad} the set of all admissible controls.

Our optimal control problem is to find $u(\cdot) \in U_{\mathrm{ad}}$ minimizing the cost functional

$$J(u(\cdot)) = \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 l(t, x(t), u(t))\, \mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{E} h(x(1))$$

with given functions

$$l : [0,1] \times H \times U \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad h : H \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}.$$

We make the following assumptions. Fix some constants $\kappa \in (0,1)$ and $K \in (0, \infty)$.

Assumption 2.1. *The operator processes A and B are weakly $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable, i.e., $\langle x, A(t)y \rangle_*$ and $\langle x, B(t)y \rangle$ are both $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes for any $x, y \in V$; and for each $(t, \omega) \in [0,1] \times \Omega$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle x, A(t)x \rangle_* + \|B(t)x\|_H^2 \leq -\kappa \|x\|_V^2 + K \|x\|_H^2 \ , \\ &\|A(t)x\|_{V^*}^2 \leq K \|x\|_V^2 \ . \qquad \forall x \in V. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2.2. *For each $(x, u) \in H \times U$, $f(\cdot, x, u)$, $g(\cdot, x, u)$ and $l(\cdot, x, u)$ are all $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes, $h(x)$ is $\mathcal{F}_1$-measurable random variable; for each $(t, u, \omega) \in [0,1] \times U \times \Omega$, f, g, l and h are globally twice Frèchet differentiable with respect to x. The functions $f_x, g_x, f_{xx}, g_{xx}, l_{xx}, h_{xx}$ are bounded by the constant K; f, g, l_x, h_x are bounded by $K(1 + \|x\|_H + |u|_U)$; l, h is bounded by $K(1 + \|x\|_H^2 + |u|_U^2)$. Herein "bounded" is in the sense of their corresponding norms.*

From a well-known result (see e.g. [10, Theorem 2.2.1]), SEE (1.1) has a unique $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable *weak solution* $x(\cdot) \in C([0,1], L^2(\Omega, H))$ for each $u(\cdot) \in U_{\mathrm{ad}}$ under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2.

To establish the L^p-estimate ($p > 2$) for the solutions to stochastic evolution equations, the following structural condition on the operator B is in force.

Assumption 2.3. *For each (t, ω),*

$$|\langle x, B(t)x \rangle| \leq K \|x\|_H^2 , \qquad \forall x \in V.$$

Here we call this condition the quasi-skew-symmetry.

To be more specific about this condition, we give a lemma as below.

Lemma 2.4. *Give $B \in \mathfrak{B}(V \to H)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *for any $x \in V$, $|\langle x, Bx \rangle| \leq K\|x\|_H^2$;*

(2) *$B + B^* \in \mathfrak{B}(H)$, where B^* is the dual operator of B;*

(3) *there are a skew-symmetric operator $S \in \mathfrak{B}(V \to H)$ and a symmetric operator $T \in \mathfrak{B}(H)$ such that $B = S + T$.*

Proof. (1)⇔(2): Noticing the fact that $B + B^*$ is symmetric, this assertion follows from the equality

$$\langle x, (B + B^*)x \rangle = 2\langle x, Bx \rangle, \qquad \forall x \in V.$$

(2)⇔(3): The assertion from (2) to (3) follows immediately by taking $S = (B - B^*)/2$ and $T = (B + B^*)/2$. The other direction is obvious. □

This structural condition is refined from many applications. As an important example, the operator B appearing in the system governed by stochastic PDEs is usually a 1st-order differential operator which naturally satisfies *the quasi-skew-symmetric condition.* For more aspects about SPDEs, we refer to [4, 15], etc.

2.2. Main results. Let operator processes $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ satisfy Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, M be a $\mathfrak{B}(H)$-valued weakly $\mathcal{F}_1$-measurable random variable and $N(\cdot)$ be a $\mathfrak{B}(H)$-valued weakly $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable stochastic process.

Definition 2.5. *If, in addition to the above setting,*

$$\|M\|^2_{\mathfrak{B}(H)} + \int_0^1 \|N(t)\|^2_{\mathfrak{B}(H)}\,\mathrm{d}t =: \Lambda_1 \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{R}), \tag{2.1}$$

then we say the four-tuple (A, B, M, N) is "appropriate"*.*

For each $\tau \in [0, 1)$, we formally define a stochastic bilinear functional on the Banach space $L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$, associated with the four-tuple (A, B, M, N), as the form:

$$[T_\tau(A, B, M, N)](\xi, \zeta) := \mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau}\left\langle z^{\tau,\xi}(1), Mz^{\tau,\zeta}(1)\right\rangle + \mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau}\int_\tau^1 \left\langle z^{\tau,\xi}(t), N(t)z^{\tau,\zeta}(t)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}t, \tag{2.2}$$

with the function $z^{\tau,\xi}(\cdot)$ (similarly for $z^{\tau,\zeta}(\cdot)$) solving the equation

$$z^{\tau,\xi}(t) = \xi + \int_\tau^t A(s)z^{\tau,\xi}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_\tau^t B(s)z^{\tau,\xi}(s)\,\mathrm{d}W_s, \qquad t \in [\tau, 1]. \tag{2.3}$$

Then we have the following representation theorem for this bilinear functional.

Theorem 2.6. *Let the four-tuple (A, B, M, N) be* "appropriate"*. Then*

a) *for each $\tau \in [0, 1]$, the stochastic bilinear functional $T_\tau(A, B, M, N)$ is well-defined, more specifically, for any $\xi, \zeta \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$, $[T_\tau(A, B, M, N)](\xi, \zeta)$ is uniquely determined (a.s.) and*

$$|[T_\tau(A, B, M, N)]\,(\xi, \zeta)| \le C(\kappa, K)\sqrt{\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau}\Lambda_1}\,\|\xi\|_H\,\|\zeta\|_H \quad (a.s.). \tag{2.4}$$

b) (representation) *there exists a $\mathfrak{B}(H)$-valued weakly $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process $P_\cdot$ with*

$$\|P_\tau\|^2_{\mathfrak{B}(H)} \le C(\kappa, K)\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau}\Lambda_1 \quad (a.s.), \quad \forall \tau \in [0, 1) \tag{2.5}$$

such that for each $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and any $\xi, \zeta \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$,

$$\langle \xi, P_\tau \zeta\rangle = [T_\tau(A, B, M, N)]\,(\xi, \zeta) \quad (a.s.). \tag{2.6}$$

We call $P_\cdot$ the Riesz representation *of $T_\cdot(A, B, M, N)$. Hereafter $C(\cdot)$ is a positive constant depending only on the values in the brackets.*

c) (weak stochastic continuity) *for each $\tau \in [0, 1)$ and any $\xi, \zeta \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$, we have*

$$\lim_{|s-t|\to 0} \mathbf{E}\,\langle \xi, (P_s - P_t)\zeta\rangle = 0, \quad \textit{with } s, t \in [\tau, 1]. \tag{2.7}$$

d) (uniqueness) *if $P^1_\cdot$ and $P^2_\cdot$ are both the Riesz representations of $T_\cdot(A, B, M, N)$, then $P^1_\tau = P^2_\tau$ a.s. for each $\tau \in [0, 1]$.*

The proof of this theorem is placed in Subsection 4.1.

Now we turn to the control problem. Define the *Hamiltonian function*

$$\mathcal{H} : [0, 1] \times H \times U \times H \times H \to \mathbb{R},$$

as the form

$$\mathcal{H}(t,x,u,p,q) := l(t,x,u) + \langle p, f(t,x,u)\rangle + \langle q, g(t,x,u)\rangle , \tag{2.8}$$

then our main result can be stated as follows.

THEOREM 2.7 (Stochastic Maximum Principle). *Let Assumptions 2.1–2.3 be satisfied. Suppose $\bar{x}$ is the state process with respect to an optimal control $\bar{u}$. Then*

i) (first-order adjoint process) *the backward stochastic evolution equation (BSEE)*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}p(t) &= -[A^*(t)p(t) + B^*(t)q(t) + \mathcal{H}_x(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t))]\,\mathrm{d}t + q(t)\,\mathrm{d}W_t,\\ p(1) &= h_x(\bar{x}(1)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

has a unique $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable (weak) solution[2] (p,q);

ii) (second-order adjoint process) *the four-tuple* $(\tilde{A},\tilde{B},\tilde{M},\tilde{N})$ *with*

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{A}(t) := A(t) + f_x(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)), \quad \tilde{B}(t) := B(t) + g_x(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)),\\ &\tilde{M} := h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1)), \quad \tilde{N}(t) := \mathcal{H}_x(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t)) \end{aligned}$$

is "appropriate", *consequently from Theorem 2.6 there is a unique $\mathfrak{B}(H)$-valued process $P_\cdot$ as the Riesz representation of $T_\cdot(\tilde{A},\tilde{B},\tilde{M},\tilde{N})$*;

iii) (maximum condition) *for each $u \in U$, the inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{H}(\tau,\bar{x}(\tau),u,p(\tau),q(\tau)) - \mathcal{H}(\tau,\bar{x}(\tau),\bar{u}(\tau),p(\tau),q(\tau))\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\langle g(\tau,\bar{x}(\tau),u) - g(\tau,\bar{x}(\tau),\bar{u}(\tau)), P_\tau[g(t,\bar{x}(t),u) - g(\tau,\bar{x}(\tau),\bar{u}(\tau))]\rangle \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

holds for a.e. $(\tau,\omega) \in [0,1)\times\Omega$.

The proof of this theorem will be completed in Section 5.

3. L^p-estimates for stochastic evolution equations.

The L^p-estimate of the solutions to evolution equations plays a basic role in our approaches. Now we consider the following linear equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}y(t) &= [A(t)y(t) + a(t)]\,\mathrm{d}t + [B(t)y(t) + b(t)]\mathrm{d}W_t,\\ y(0) &= y_0 \in H. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Under Assumption 2.1, the above equation has a unique ($\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable) solution $y(\cdot) \in C([0,T], L^2(\Omega,H))$ providing two H-valued $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes a and b such that

$$\int_0^1 \left(\mathbf{E}\,\|a(s)\|_H^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^1 \mathbf{E}\,\|b(s)\|_H^2\,\mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

If additionally the operator B satisfies *the quasi-skew-symmetric condition*, then we have

LEMMA 3.1. *Let A and B satisfy Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. If*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &:= \int_0^1 \left(\mathbf{E}\,\|a(s)\|_H^{2n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2n}}\mathrm{d}s < \infty,\\ \beta &:= \int_0^1 \left(\mathbf{E}\,\|b(s)\|_H^{2n}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}\mathrm{d}s < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

---

[2] For the definition of (weak) solutions to BSEEs, we refer to [6, Def. 3.1]

then the solution to equation (3.1) *satisfies*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbf{E} \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2n} \leq C(\kappa, K, n) \Big(\left\| y_0 \right\|_H^{2n} + \alpha^{2n} + \beta^n \Big).$$

Proof. The assertion of $n = 1$ is a classical result. Here we prove the case of $n > 1$. By the Itô formula (see [10, Theorem 3.1]), we have

$$\mathrm{d}\|y(t)\|_H^2 = \big(2 \left\langle y(t), Ay(t) + a(t) \right\rangle_* + \|By(t) + b(t)\|_H^2 \big) \,\mathrm{d}t + 2 \left\langle y(t), By(t) + b(t) \right\rangle \mathrm{d}W_t.$$

Then we use the classical Itô formula to evaluate $\|y(t)\|_H^{2n} = (\|y(t)\|_H^2)^n$. From Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| By(t) \right\|_H^2 \leq C(K) \left\| y(t) \right\|_V^2, \\ &\left\langle y(t), By(t) \right\rangle \leq K \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{d} \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2n} \\
&= n \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \Big[2 \left\langle y(t), Ay(t) + a(t) \right\rangle_* + \left\| By(t) + b(t) \right\|_H^2 \Big] \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\quad + 2n(n-1) \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-2)} \left| \left\langle y(t), By(t) + b(t) \right\rangle \right|^2 \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\quad + 2n \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \left\langle y(t), By(t) + b(t) \right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}W_t \\
&\leq n \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \Big[2 \left\langle y(t), Ay(t) \right\rangle_* + \left\| By(t) \right\|_H^2 + 2 \left\langle By(t), b(t) \right\rangle + 2 \left\langle y(t), a(t) \right\rangle \Big] \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\quad + 4n(n-1) \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-2)} \left| \left\langle y(t), By(t) \right\rangle \right|^2 \,\mathrm{d}t + n(4n-3) \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \left\| b(t) \right\|_H^2 \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\quad + 2n \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \left\langle y(t), By(t) + b(t) \right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}W_t \\
&\leq n \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \Big[-\frac{\kappa}{2} \left\| y(t) \right\|_V^2 + C(\kappa, K, n) \left\| b(t) \right\|_H^2 + 2 \left\| y(t) \right\|_H \left\| a(t) \right\|_H \Big] \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\quad + n(4n-3)K \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2n} \,\mathrm{d}t + 2n \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \left\langle y(t), By(t) + b(t) \right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}W_t. \\
&\leq \ \Big[2 \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2n-1} \left\| a(t) \right\|_H + C(\kappa, K, n) \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2n-2} \left\| b(t) \right\|_H^2 \Big] \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\quad + C(K, n) \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2n} \,\mathrm{d}t + 2n \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2(n-1)} \left\langle y(t), By(t) + b(t) \right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}W_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Define stopping time

$$\tau^k := \inf \Big\{ t \in [0, 1) : \mathbf{E} \left\| y(t) \right\|_H^{2n} > k \Big\} \wedge 1.$$

Notice that from Young's equality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \left\| y(t \wedge \tau^k) \right\|_H^{2n-1} \left\| a(t \wedge \tau^k) \right\|_H \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \Big(\mathbf{E} \left\| y(t \wedge \tau^k) \right\|_H^{2n} \Big)^{\frac{2n-1}{2n}} \Big(\mathbf{E} \left\| a(t \wedge \tau^k) \right\|_H^{2n} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2n}} \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq \Big(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbf{E} \left\| y(t \wedge \tau^k) \right\|_H^{2n} \Big)^{\frac{2n-1}{2n}} \int_0^1 \Big(\mathbf{E} \left\| a(t) \right\|_H^{2n} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2n}} \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbf{E} \left\| y(t \wedge \tau^k) \right\|_H^{2n} + C(\kappa, K, n) \alpha^{2n},
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \left\|y(t\wedge\tau^k)\right\|_H^{2n-2}\left\|b(t\wedge\tau^k)\right\|_H^2 \,\mathrm{d}t \le \frac{1}{4}\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}\left\|y(t\wedge\tau^k)\right\|_H^{2n} + C(\kappa,K,n)\beta^n.$$

Then integrating (3.2) on $[0, t\wedge\tau^k)$, taking expectation, applying the Gronwall inequality, and by the above two inequalities, we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}\left\|y(t\wedge\tau^k)\right\|_H^{2n} \le C(\kappa,K,n)\left(\|y_0\|_H^{2n}+\alpha^{2n}+\beta^n\right).$$

Letting k tend to infinity, we conclude the lemma. □

Remark 3.2. (1) *The* quasi-skew-symmetric condition *is unnecessary in the case of* $n=1$, *since the term* $2n(n-1)\|y(t)\|_H^{2(n-2)}|\langle y(t), By(t)+b(t)\rangle|^2\,\mathrm{d}t$ *does not appear in this case.*

(2) *This lemma can be extended to the case of any real number* $n\in[1,\infty)$, *while some related techniques concerning* $n\in(1,2)$ *can be borrowed from e.g. [16].*

Proceeding a similar argument, we have the L^p-estimate for SEE (1.1).

Corollary 3.3. *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, the solution* $x(\cdot)$ *to SEE* (1.1) *satisfies*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}\|x(t)\|_H^{2n} \le C(\kappa,K)\left(1+\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_U^{2n}\right)$$

with $n=1,2$.

4. Investigation into a stochastic bilinear functional.

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 2.6 and study the properties of the operator-valued process $P_\cdot$.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 2.6.

For convenience, we write $T_\tau(A,B,M,N)$ as T_τ in the rest of this section, and hereafter denote $C=C(\kappa,K)$.

Step 1. The well-posedness of $T_\cdot$.

From Lemma 3.1, equation (2.3) has a unique solution for each $\xi\in L^4(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_\tau,H)$; moreover, replacing the expectation by conditional expectation in the argument, one can easily get

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,1]}\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau}\left\|z^{\tau,\xi}(t)\right\|_H^4 \le C\|\xi\|_H^4. \tag{4.1}$$

Thus $T_\tau(\xi,\zeta)$ is uniquely determined (a.s.) for any $\xi,\zeta\in L^4(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_\tau,H)$, and the estimate (2.4) clearly follows from the above inequality.

Step 2. Construction of $P_\cdot$.

Since $\left(\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\tau}\Lambda_1;\tau\in[0,1]\right)$ is a Doob's martingale and the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ is continuous, we can select and fix a continuous version of $\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_\cdot}\Lambda_1$, denoted by $\Lambda_\cdot$. Now fix an arbitrary $\tau\in[0,1]$. Take a standard complete orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}$ of H. Then there is a set of full probability $\Omega_1\subset\Omega$ such that for each $\omega\in\Omega_1$,

$$|[T_\tau(e_i,e_j)](\omega)| \le C\sqrt{\Lambda_\tau(\omega)},\quad \forall i,j\in\mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Hence, from the Riesz representation theorem, there is a unique $P_\tau(\omega)\in\mathfrak{B}(H)$ for each $\omega\in\Omega_1$ such that

$$\langle x, P_\tau(\omega)y\rangle = [T_\tau(x,y)](\omega),\quad \forall x,y\in H,$$

and

$$\|P_\tau(\omega)\|_{\mathfrak{B}(H)} \le C\sqrt{\Lambda_\tau(\omega)}, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_1.$$

On the other hand, it follows from the definition of T_τ that (i) for each $\omega \in \Omega_1$ and any $E \in \mathcal{F}_\tau$,

$$\left[T_\tau(x1_E, y1_E)\right](\omega) = 1_E(\omega)\left[T_\tau(x,y)\right](\omega), \quad \forall x, y \in H;$$

(ii) for each $\omega \in \Omega_1$ and any $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{F}_\tau$ with $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$,

$$\left[T_\tau(x1_{E_1}, y1_{E_2})\right](\omega) = 0, \quad \forall x, y \in H.$$

Thus, for any simple H-valued $\mathcal{F}_\tau$-measurable random variables ξ, ζ, we have

$$\langle \xi(\omega), P_\tau(\omega)\zeta(\omega)\rangle = \left[T_\tau(\xi,\zeta)\right](\omega), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_1.$$

This along with a standard argument of approximation yields the relation (2.6).

Step 3. Weak stochastic continuity of $P_\cdot$.

Fix an arbitrary $\tau \in [0,1)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $t < s$. Then for any $\xi, \zeta \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi, \left(P_s - P_t\right)\zeta\right\rangle \;=\;& \mathbf{E}\left\langle z^{s,\xi}(1), Mz^{s,\zeta}(1)\right\rangle + \mathbf{E}\int_s^1 \left\langle z^{s,\xi}(r), N(r)z^{s,\zeta}(r)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}r \\
& - \mathbf{E}\left\langle z^{t,\xi}(1), Mz^{t,\zeta}(1)\right\rangle - \mathbf{E}\int_s^1 \left\langle z^{t,\xi}(r), N(r)z^{t,\zeta}(r)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}r \\
& - \mathbf{E}\int_t^s \left\langle z^{t,\xi}(r), N(r)z^{t,\zeta}(r)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}r.
\end{aligned}$$

First, it follows from (4.1) and Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\mathbf{E}\int_t^s \left\langle z^{\tau,\xi}(r), N(r)z^{\tau,\zeta}(r)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}r\right|^2 \\
&\le C\mathbf{E}\int_t^s \|N(r)\|^2_{\mathfrak{B}(H)}\,\mathrm{d}r \cdot \sqrt{\mathbf{E}\,\|\xi\|_H^4 \cdot \mathbf{E}\,\|\zeta\|_H^4} \to 0, \quad \text{as } |s-t| \to 0. \qquad (4.2)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it is well-known that the trajectory of $z^{\tau,\xi}(\cdot)$ is continuous in H (see [10]), which along with (4.1) and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\mathbf{E}\int_s^1 \left\langle z^{s,\xi}(r), N(r)z^{s,\zeta}(r)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}r - \mathbf{E}\int_s^1 \left\langle z^{t,\xi}(r), N(r)z^{t,\zeta}(r)\right\rangle \mathrm{d}r\right|^2 \\
&\le C\left(\mathbf{E}\Lambda_1\right)\left(\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\,\|\xi\|_H^4}\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\,\|\zeta - z^{t,\zeta}(s)\|_H^4} + \sqrt{\mathbf{E}\,\|\zeta\|_H^4}\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\,\|\xi - z^{t,\xi}(s)\|_H^4}\right) \\
&\to 0, \qquad \text{as} \quad |s-t| \to 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\left|\mathbf{E}\left\langle z^{s,\xi}(1), Mz^{s,\zeta}(1)\right\rangle - \mathbf{E}\left\langle z^{t,\xi}(1), Mz^{t,\zeta}(1)\right\rangle\right| \to 0, \qquad \text{as} \quad |s-t| \to 0.$$

Therefore, we have for any $\xi, \zeta \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$,

$$\lim_{s\to t}\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi, (P_s - P_t)\zeta\right\rangle = 0, \quad \text{with } s, t \in [\tau, 1].$$

The uniqueness of $P_\cdot$ is obvious. Therefore, The proof of Theorem 2.6 is complete.

4.2. A property of P. For each time $\tau \in [0,1)$, define

$$B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V) := \left\{ \xi \in L(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V) : \|\xi(\cdot)\|_V \text{ is bounded} \right\}.$$

Obviously, $B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V)$ is dense in $L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$.

Give the same four-tuple (A, B, M, N) as in Theorem 2.6. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1-\tau)$. For each $\xi \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$, consider the following equation

$$z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(t) = \int_\tau^t A z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(s)\mathrm{d}s + \int_\tau^t [B z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(s)(t;\tau,\xi) + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} 1_{[\tau,\tau+\varepsilon)} \xi]\, \mathrm{d}W_s \tag{4.3}$$

and the following bilinear functional on $L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$ with parameter ε

$$[T_\tau^\varepsilon(A,B,M,N)](\xi,\zeta) := \mathbf{E}\left\langle z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(1), M z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\zeta}(1) \right\rangle + \mathbf{E}\int_\tau^1 \left\langle z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(t), N(t) z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\zeta}(t) \right\rangle \mathrm{d}t.$$

From Lemma 3.1, equation (4.3) has a unique solution $z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(\cdot)$ such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbf{E}\left\| z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(t) \right\|_H^4 \le C\mathbf{E}\left\|\xi\right\|_H^4.$$

Thus T_τ^ε is well-defined.

Next, we shall prove the following result concerning the relation between T_τ^ε and P_τ, which plays a crucial role in the proof of the maximum principle.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Under the above setting, we have for each $\tau \in [0,1)$ and any $\xi, \zeta \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$,*

$$\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi, P_\tau \zeta \right\rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} [T_\tau^\varepsilon(A,B,M,N)](\xi,\zeta).$$

REMARK 4.2. *Compared with equation (2.3) given the value ξ in initial time τ, the unknown process in equation (4.3) is affected by ξ during a small period. The latter form appears in our derivation of the stochastic maximum principle.*

This proposition follows from several lemmas. For the sake of convenience, we write $T_\tau^\varepsilon(A,B,M,N)$ as T_τ^ε in this subsection. The first lemma gives a simple approximation of $z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(\tau+\varepsilon)$.

LEMMA 4.3. *For each $\tau \in [0,1)$ and each $\xi \in B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V)$, we have*

$$\mathbf{E}\left\| z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(\tau+\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(W_{\tau+\varepsilon} - W_\tau\right)\xi \right\|_H^4 \le C\varepsilon^2 \cdot \mathbf{E}\left\|\xi\right\|_V^4.$$

Proof. For the sake of convenience, we set

$$z_t := z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(t), \qquad \xi_t := \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(W_{\tau+t} - W_\tau\right)\xi. \tag{4.4}$$

Then for $t \in [\tau, \tau+\varepsilon]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}(z_t - \xi_t) &= \left[A(z_t - \xi_t) + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}(W_t - W_\tau)A\xi\right]\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \left[B(z_t - \xi_t) + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}(W_t - W_\tau)B\xi\right]\mathrm{d}W_t. \end{aligned}$$

By the Itô formula and some standard arguments, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left\|z_{\tau+\varepsilon} - \xi_{\tau+\varepsilon}\right\|_H^4 &\le C\left[\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{-1}\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\left(\left\|\xi\right\|_V^4 \left|W_t - W_\tau\right|^4\right)}\,\mathrm{d}t\right]^2 \\ &\le C\left[\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{-1}\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\left\|\xi\right\|_V^4}\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\left|W_t - W_\tau\right|^4}\,\mathrm{d}t\right]^2 \\ &= C\varepsilon^2 \cdot \mathbf{E}\left\|\xi\right\|_V^4. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the lemma. □

Notice the fact that for any $\xi, \zeta \in B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_\tau^\varepsilon(\xi,\zeta) &= \mathbf{E}\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \left\langle z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(t), N(t) z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\zeta}(t)\right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{E}\left\langle z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(\tau+\varepsilon), P_{\tau+\varepsilon} z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\zeta}(\tau+\varepsilon)\right\rangle \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we let ε tend to 0. On the one hand, one can show that the term I_1 tends to 0 similarly as in (4.2); on the other hand, by means of the above lemma, the term I_2 must tend to the same limit as $\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi_{\tau+\varepsilon}, P_{\tau+\varepsilon}\zeta_{\tau+\varepsilon}\right\rangle$, where $\xi_t := \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(W_{\tau+t} - W_\tau\right)\xi$ and $\zeta_t := \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(W_{\tau+t} - W_\tau\right)\zeta$. Therefore, we have

Lemma 4.4. *For each $\tau \in [0,1)$ and any $\xi, \zeta \in B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V)$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0}\left|\mathbf{E}\big[\varepsilon^{-1}\left|W_{\tau+\varepsilon} - W_\tau\right|^2 \langle \xi, P_{\tau+\varepsilon}\zeta\rangle\big] - T_\tau^\varepsilon(\xi,\zeta)\right| = 0.$$

Proof. Noticing that

$$\mathbf{E}\big[\varepsilon^{-1}\left|W_{\tau+\varepsilon} - W_\tau\right|^2 \langle \xi, P_{\tau+\varepsilon}\zeta\rangle\big] = \mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi_{\tau+\varepsilon}, P_{\tau+\varepsilon}\zeta_{\tau+\varepsilon}\right\rangle,$$

we need only show

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\left|\mathbf{E}\big\langle \xi_{\tau+\varepsilon}, P_{\tau+\varepsilon}\zeta_{\tau+\varepsilon}\big\rangle - I_2\right| = 0.$$

Indeed, from (2.5) and Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}\left|\langle \xi_{\tau+\varepsilon}, P_{\tau+\varepsilon}\zeta_{\tau+\varepsilon}\rangle - \langle z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(\tau+\varepsilon), P_{\tau+\varepsilon} z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\zeta}(\tau+\varepsilon)\rangle\right| \\ &\leq C\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\Lambda_1}\big(\mathbf{E}\|\xi\|_H^4\big)^{\frac{1}{4}}\big(\mathbf{E}\|z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\zeta}(\tau+\varepsilon) - \zeta_{\tau+\varepsilon}\|_H^4\big)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\quad + C\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\Lambda_1}\big(\mathbf{E}\|\zeta\|_H^4\big)^{\frac{1}{4}}\big(\mathbf{E}\|z_\varepsilon^{\tau,\xi}(\tau+\varepsilon) - \xi_{\tau+\varepsilon}\|_H^4\big)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\to 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the lemma. □

On the other hand, from the continuity of $P.$ we have the following

Lemma 4.5. *For each $\tau \in [0,1)$ and any $\xi, \zeta \in B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V)$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\mathbf{E}\Big[\varepsilon^{-1}\left|W_{\tau+\varepsilon} - W_\tau\right|^2 \langle \xi, \left(P_{\tau+\varepsilon} - P_\tau\right)\zeta\rangle\Big] = 0.$$

Proof. It follows from (2.5), the boundedness of ξ, ζ, and Doob's martingale inequality (see [5]) that

$$\left|\langle \xi, \left(P_{\tau+\varepsilon} - P_\tau\right)\zeta\rangle\right|^2 \leq C(\kappa, K)\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t}\Lambda_1\Big)\|\xi\|_H^2\,\|\zeta\|_H^2 \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Then from Theorem 2.6(c) and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\mathbf{E}\big[\varepsilon^{-1}\left|W_{\tau+\varepsilon} - W_\tau\right|^2 \langle \xi, \left(P_{\tau+\varepsilon} - P_\tau\right)\zeta\rangle\big]\right|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}\big[\varepsilon^{-2}\left|W_{\tau+\varepsilon} - W_\tau\right|^4\big]\mathbf{E}\left|\langle \xi, \left(P_{\tau+\varepsilon} - P_\tau\right)\zeta\rangle\right|^2 \\ &\leq 3\mathbf{E}\left|\langle \xi, \left(P_{\tau+\varepsilon} - P_\tau\right)\zeta\rangle\right|^2 \to 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved. □

Finally we arrive at the position of completing the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Proof. [Proof of Proposition 4.1] Combining Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, we have for each $\tau \in [0,1)$ and any $\xi^b, \zeta^b \in B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V)$,

$$\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi^b, P_\tau \zeta^b \right\rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} T_\tau^\varepsilon(\xi^b, \zeta^b). \tag{4.5}$$

Next, fix any $\xi, \zeta \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, H)$. For arbitrary $\delta > 0$, we can find $\xi^b, \zeta^b \in B(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\tau, V)$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\|\xi - \xi^b\|_H^4 + \mathbf{E}\|\zeta - \zeta^b\|_H^4 < \delta^4.$$

Then one can show

$$\left|\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi, P_\tau \zeta \right\rangle - \mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi^b, P_\tau^b \zeta \right\rangle\right| + \left|T_\tau^\varepsilon(\xi, \zeta) - T_\tau^\varepsilon(\xi^b, \zeta^b)\right| < C\delta\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\Lambda_1}\left[\mathbf{E}(\|\xi\|_H^4 + \|\zeta\|_H^4)\right]^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Thus we have

$$\left|\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi, P_\tau \xi \right\rangle - T_\tau^\varepsilon(\xi, \xi)\right| < \left|\mathbf{E}\left\langle \xi^b, P_\tau \xi^b \right\rangle - T_\tau^\varepsilon(\xi^b, \xi^b)\right| + C\delta\sqrt{\mathbf{E}\Lambda_1}\left[\mathbf{E}(\|\xi\|_H^4 + \|\zeta\|_H^4)\right]^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

From (4.5) and the arbitrariness of δ, we conclude the proposition. □

5. Proof of the stochastic maximum principle. In this section, we are going to prove our main theorem, the stochastic maximum principle.

5.1. Spike variation and second-order expansion. Assume $\bar{x}$ is the state process with respect to a optimal control $\bar{u}$.

Following a classical technique in the optimal control, we construct a perturbed admissible control in the following way (named *spike variation*)

$$u^\varepsilon(t) := \begin{cases} u, & \text{if } t \in [\tau, \tau + \varepsilon], \\ \bar{u}(t), & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

with fixed $\tau \in [0,1)$, sufficiently small positive ε, and an arbitrary U-valued $\mathcal{F}_\tau$-measurable random variable u satisfying $\mathbf{E}|u|_U^4 < \infty$.

Let x^ε be the state process with respect to control u^ε. For the sake of convenience, we denote for $\varphi = f, g, l, f_x, g_x, l_x, f_{xx}, g_{xx}, l_{xx}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varphi}(t) &:= \varphi(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)), \\ \varphi^\Delta(t) &:= \varphi(t, \bar{x}(t), u^\varepsilon(t)) - \bar{\varphi}(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)), \\ \tilde{\varphi}_{xx}^\varepsilon(t) &:= \int_0^1 \varphi_{xx}\left(t, \bar{x}(t) + \lambda[x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t)], u^\varepsilon(t)\right) \mathrm{d}\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

From the basic L^p estimates, we have

Lemma 5.1. *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \mathbf{E}\left\|\Xi(t)\right\|_H^2 := \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \mathbf{E}\left\|x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t) - x_1(t) - x_2(t)\right\|_H^2 = o(\varepsilon^2),$$

where x_1 and x_2 are the solutions respectively to

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(t) = & \int_0^t [A(s)x_1(s) + \bar{f}_x(s)x_1(s) + f^{\Delta}(s)] \, \mathrm{d}s \\ & + \int_0^t [B(s)x_1(s) + \bar{g}_x(s)x_1(s) + g^{\Delta}(s)] \mathrm{d}W_s, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} x_2(t) = & \int_0^t [A(s)x_2(s) + \bar{f}_x(s)x_2(s) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{f}_{xx}(s) \left(x_1 \otimes x_1\right)(s) + f_x^{\Delta}(s)x_1(s)] \, \mathrm{d}s \\ & + \int_0^t [B(s)x_2(s) + \bar{g}_x(s)x_2(s) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{g}_{xx}(s) \left(x_1 \otimes x_1\right)(s) + g_x^{\Delta}(s)x_1(s)] \, \mathrm{d}W_s. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. The proof is rather standard (see, e.g. [19]), so here we sketch the process. From Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\varepsilon^{-2} \sup_t \mathbf{E} \left\| x_1(t) \right\|_H^4 + \varepsilon^{-1} \sup_t \mathbf{E} \left\| x_1(t) \right\|_H^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} \sup_t \mathbf{E} \left\| x_2(t) \right\|_H^2 \le C, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\varepsilon^{-2} \sup_t \mathbf{E} \left\| x^{\varepsilon}(t) - \bar{x}(t) \right\|_H^4 + \varepsilon^{-1} \sup_t \mathbf{E} \left\| x^{\varepsilon}(t) - \bar{x}(t) \right\|_H^2 \le C, \tag{5.4}$$

$$\varepsilon^{-2} \sup_t \mathbf{E} \left\| x^{\varepsilon}(t) - \bar{x}(t) - x_1(t) \right\|_H^2 \le C. \tag{5.5}$$

On the other hand, a direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi(t) = & \int_0^t \left[A(s)\Xi(s) + \bar{f}_x(s)\Xi(s) + \alpha^{\varepsilon}(s) \right] \, \mathrm{d}s \\ & + \int_0^t \left[B(s)\Xi(s) + \bar{g}_x(s)\Xi(s) + \beta^{\varepsilon}(s) \right] \, \mathrm{d}W_s, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{\varepsilon}(s) := & f_x^{\Delta}(s)(x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s) - x_1(s)) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{f}_{xx}(s) - \bar{f}_{xx}(s))(x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) \otimes (x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\bar{f}_{xx}(s) \left((x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) \otimes (x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) - (x_1 \otimes x_1)(s) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{\varepsilon}(s) := & g_x^{\Delta}(s)(x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s) - x_1(s)) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{g}_{xx}(s) - \bar{g}_{xx}(s))(x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) \otimes (x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\bar{g}_{xx}(s) \left((x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) \otimes (x^{\varepsilon}(s) - \bar{x}(s)) - (x_1 \otimes x_1)(s) \right). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.1, (5.3)–(5.5) and Legesbue's dominated convergence theorem we conclude that

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \mathbf{E} \left\| \Xi(t) \right\|_H^2 \le \left[\int_0^1 \left(\mathbf{E} \left\| \alpha^{\varepsilon}(s) \right\|_H^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}s \right]^2 + \int_0^1 \mathbf{E} \left\| \beta^{\varepsilon}(s) \right\|_H^2 \, \mathrm{d}s = o(\varepsilon^2).$$

The lemma is proved. □

With the aid of the above lemma and by the fact

$$J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \geq 0,$$

we can prove the following result.

Lemma 5.2. *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} o(\varepsilon) \ &\leq \ \mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \Big[l^\Delta(t) + \big\langle \bar{l}_x(t), x_1(t) + x_2(t) \big\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\big\langle x_1(t), \bar{l}_{xx}(t) x_1(t) \big\rangle \Big] \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E}\Big[\langle h_x(\bar{x}(1)), x_1(1) + x_2(1) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x_1(1), h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1)) x_1(1) \rangle \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. The proof is also standard (see, e.g. [19]), we give a sketch here. A direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \ &\leq \ J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \\ &= \ \mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \Big[l^\Delta(t) + \big\langle \bar{l}_x(t), x_1(1) + x_2(1) \big\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\big\langle x_1(t) + \bar{l}_{xx}(t) x_1(t) \big\rangle \Big] \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E}\Big[\langle h_x(\bar{x}(1)), x_1(1) + x_2(1) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x_1(1), h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1)) x_1(1) \rangle \Big] + \gamma(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\varepsilon) \ &:= \ \mathbf{E}\,\langle h_x(\bar{x}(1)), \Xi(1) \rangle + \mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \big\langle \bar{l}_x(t), \Xi(t) \big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\Big\langle \Big[\tilde{h}^\varepsilon_{xx} - h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1)) \Big] (x^\varepsilon(1) - \bar{x}(1)), x^\varepsilon(1) - \bar{x}(1) \Big\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\,\langle h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1))(x^\varepsilon(1) - \bar{x}(1)), x^\varepsilon(1) - \bar{x}(1) - x_1(1) \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\,\langle h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1))(x^\varepsilon(1) - \bar{x}(1) - x_1(1)), x_1(1) \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \Big\langle \Big[\tilde{l}^\varepsilon_{xx}(t) - \bar{l}_{xx}(t) \Big] (x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t)), x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t) \Big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \big\langle \bar{l}_{xx}(t)(x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t)), x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t) - x_1(t) \big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \big\langle \bar{l}_{xx}(t)(x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t) - x_1(t)), x_1(t) \big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\tilde{h}^\varepsilon_{xx} := \int_0^1 h_{xx}\left(\bar{x}(1) + \lambda[x^\varepsilon(1) - \bar{x}(1)] \right) \mathrm{d}\lambda.$$

Consequently, by (5.3)–(5.5) and the Legesbue dominated convergence theorem we can deduce

$$|\gamma(\varepsilon)| = o(\varepsilon),$$

which implies the lemma. □

5.2. First-order duality analysis. We need some duality analysis in order to tend ε to 0 in inequality (5.6) and get the maximum condition (2.10). Recall the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}(t,x,u,p,q) = l(t,x,u) + \langle p, f(t,x,u)\rangle + \langle q, g(t,x,u)\rangle ,$$

and BSEE (2.9). Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, it follows from Du-Meng [6, Propostion 3.2] that equation (2.9) has a unique $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable *weak solution* (p,q) such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbf{E}\,\|p(t)\|_H^2 + \mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \|q(t)\|_H^2 \ \mathrm{d}t \le C(\kappa,K)\Big(1+\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbf{E}\,|\bar{u}(t)|_U^2\Big). \tag{5.7}$$

Thus the assertion (i) of Theorem 2.7 holds true. Furthermore, from Lemma 5.2 we have

LEMMA 5.3. *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) \ &\le\ \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} [\mathcal{H}(t,\bar{x}(t),u,p(t),q(t)) - \mathcal{H}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t))]\ \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \langle x_1(t), \mathcal{H}_{xx}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t))x_1(t)\rangle\ \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\,\langle x_1(1), h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1))x_1(1)\rangle , \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where (p,q) *is the solution to equation* (2.9).

Proof. From the duality between the SEE and BSEE (or by the Itô formula), and by (5.3) and (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \left[\langle \bar{l}_x(t), x_1(t)+x_2(t)\rangle\right]\ \mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{E}\,\langle h_x(\bar{x}(1)), x_1(1)+x_2(1)\rangle \\ &= \ \mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \Big[\Big\langle p(t), f^\Delta(t) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{f}_{xx}(t)\,(x_1\otimes x_1)\,(t) + f_x^\Delta(t)x_1(t)\Big\rangle\Big]\ \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \Big[\Big\langle q(t), g^\Delta(t) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{g}_{xx}(t)\,(x_1\otimes x_1)\,(t) + g_x^\Delta(t)x_1(t)\Big\rangle\Big]\ \mathrm{d}t \\ &= \ o(\varepsilon) + \mathbf{E}\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \left[\langle p(t), f^\Delta(t)\rangle + \langle q(t), g^\Delta(t)\rangle\right]\ \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \left[\langle p(t), \bar{f}_{xx}(t)\,(x_1\otimes x_1)\,(t)\rangle + \langle q(t), \bar{g}_{xx}(t)\,(x_1\otimes x_1)\,(t)\rangle\right]\ \mathrm{d}t, \end{aligned}$$

this along with Lemma 5.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) \ &\le\ \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 [\mathcal{H}(t,\bar{x}(t),u^\varepsilon(t),p(t),q(t)) - \mathcal{H}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t))]\ \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \langle x_1(t), \mathcal{H}_{xx}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t))x_1(t)\rangle\ \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\,\langle x_1(1), h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1))x_1(1)\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of u^ε, we conclude the lemma. □

From the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, the first-order expansion part, which is the first term on the right hand side of inequality (5.8), tends to

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\mathcal{H}(\tau,\bar{x}(\tau),u,p(\tau),q(\tau))-\mathcal{H}(\tau,\bar{x}(\tau),\bar{u}(\tau),p(\tau),q(\tau))\right], \qquad \text{a.e. } \tau$$

for each u when ε tends to 0. By the arbitrariness of u and some standard techniques, this yields the first term of maximum condition (2.10).

5.3. Second-order duality analysis and completion of the proof. In this subsection, we deal with the second order expansion part which is the second and third terms on the right hand side of inequality (5.8), and complete the proof of Theorem 2.7.

Recall the four-tuple $(\tilde{A},\tilde{B},\tilde{M},\tilde{N})$ with

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{A}(t):=A(t)+\bar{f}_x(t),\quad \tilde{B}(t):=B(t)+\bar{g}_x(t),\\&\tilde{M}:=h_{xx}(\bar{x}(1)),\quad \tilde{N}(t):=\mathcal{H}_{xx}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t)).\end{aligned}$$

Bearing in mind Assumptions 2.1–2.3 and the estimate (5.7), we can easily obtain that the four-tuple $(\tilde{A},\tilde{B},\tilde{M},\tilde{N})$ is "appropriate", and then from Theorem 2.6 there is a unique $\mathfrak{B}(H)$-valued process $P.$ as the Riesz representation of $T.(\tilde{A},\tilde{B},\tilde{M},\tilde{N})$. Hence, the assertion (ii) of Theorem 2.7 is proved.

Observe that the solution x_1 to equation (5.1) can be decomposed as

$$x_1=\sqrt{\varepsilon}(x^{(1)}+x^{(2)}),$$

where $x^{(1)}$ and $x^{(2)}$ are the solutions to the equations

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{d}x^{(1)}(t)=[\tilde{A}(t)x^{(1)}(t)+\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}f^{\Delta}(t)]\,\mathrm{d}t+\tilde{B}(t)x^{(1)}(t)\,\mathrm{d}W_t,\\&\mathrm{d}x^{(2)}(t)=\tilde{A}(t)x^{(2)}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t+[\tilde{B}(t)x^{(2)}(t)+\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}g^{\Delta}(t)]\,\mathrm{d}W_t,\\&x^{(1)}|_{[0,\tau]}=x^{(2)}|_{[0,\tau]}=0.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the L^p-estimates that

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon^{-2}\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}\big\|x^{(1)}(t)\big\|^4+\varepsilon^{-1}\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}\big\|x^{(1)}(t)\big\|^2&\le C,\\\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}\big\|x^{(2)}(t)\big\|^4+\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbf{E}\big\|x^{(2)}(t)\big\|^2&\le C,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1\left\langle x_1(t),\tilde{N}(t)x_1(t)\right\rangle\mathrm{d}t+\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\left\langle x_1(1),\tilde{M}x_1(1)\right\rangle\\&\quad=o(1)+\mathbf{E}\int_0^1\left\langle x^{(2)}(t),\tilde{N}(t)x^{(2)}(t)\right\rangle\mathrm{d}t+\mathbf{E}\left\langle x^{(2)}(1),\tilde{M}x^{(2)}(1)\right\rangle. \qquad (5.9)\end{aligned}$$

Now we introduce the following equation

$$z^{\varepsilon}(t)=\int_{\tau}^{t}\tilde{A}(s)z^{\varepsilon}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s+\int_{\tau}^{t}[\tilde{B}(s)z^{\varepsilon}(s)+\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}1_{[\tau,\tau+\varepsilon)}g^{\Delta}(\tau)]\,\mathrm{d}W_s.$$

Then we have

LEMMA 5.4. *For a.e.* $\tau\in[0,1)$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\sup_{t\in[\tau,1]}\mathbf{E}\big\|x^{(2)}(t)-z^{\varepsilon}(t)\big\|_H^4=0.$$

Proof. By the Itô formula, we have for each $\tau \in [0,1]$,

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,1]} \mathbf{E}\big\|x^{(2)}(t) - z^\varepsilon(t)\big\|_H^4 \le C(\kappa, K)\cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(t) - g^\Delta(\tau)\right\|_H^4 \,\mathrm{d}t.$$

From the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, we have for each $X \in L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, H)$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(t) - X\right\|_H^4 \,\mathrm{d}t = \mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(\tau) - X\right\|_H^4, \quad \text{for a.e. } \tau \in [0,1).$$

Since $L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, H)$ is separable, let X run through a countable density subset Q in $L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, H)$, and denote

$$E := \bigcup E_X := \bigcup \big\{\tau : \text{the above relation does not hold for } X\big\}.$$

Then we have $\mathrm{meas}(E) = 0$. For arbitrary positive η, take an $X \in Q$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(\tau) - X\right\|_H^4 < \eta,$$

then for each $\tau \in [0,1)\backslash E$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(t) - g^\Delta(\tau)\right\|_H^4 \,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\le \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{8}{\varepsilon}\int_\tau^{\tau+\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(t) - X\right\|_H^4 dt + 8\mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(\tau) - X\right\|_H^4 \\
&\le 16\mathbf{E}\left\|g^\Delta(\tau) - X\right\|_H^4 < 16\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

From the arbitrariness of η, we conclude this lemma. ☐

From the the above lemma and (5.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \left\langle x_1(t), \tilde{N}(t)x_1(t)\right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{E}\left\langle x_1(1), \tilde{M}x_1(1)\right\rangle \\
&\quad = o(1) + \mathbf{E}\int_\tau^1 \left\langle z^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{N}(t)z^\varepsilon(t)\right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{E}\left\langle z^\varepsilon(1), \tilde{M}z^\varepsilon(1)\right\rangle, \quad \forall \tau \in [0,1)\backslash E. \quad (5.10)
\end{aligned}$$

Keeping in mind the above relation, and applying Proposition 4.1, we conclude for each $\tau \in [0,1)\backslash E$,

$$\mathbf{E}\left\langle g^\Delta(\tau), P_\tau g^\Delta(\tau)\right\rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\varepsilon^{-1}\left\{\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 \left\langle x_1(t), \tilde{N}(t)x_1(t)\right\rangle \,\mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{E}\left\langle x_1(1), \tilde{M}x_1(1)\right\rangle\right\}.$$

This along with Lemma 5.3 yields for each $u \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \ \le\ & \mathbf{E}\left[\mathcal{H}(\tau, \bar{x}(\tau), u, p(\tau), q(\tau)) - \mathcal{H}(\tau, \bar{x}(\tau), \bar{u}(\tau), p(\tau), q(\tau))\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\left\langle g^\Delta(\tau), P_\tau g^\Delta(\tau)\right\rangle, \qquad \text{a.e. } \tau \in [0,1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the desired maximum condition (2.10) follows from a standard argument; see, for example, [11]. This completes the proof of the stochastic maximum principle.

REMARK 5.5. *Usually, the Lebesgue differentiation theorem is used at the end of the derivation of maximum principle. However, we utilize this sharp result at an early* *step of the second-order duality analysis (Lemma 5.4). The benefit of such a different treatment can be seen from relation* (5.10)*. Indeed, the dynamic process* $x_1(\cdot)$ *on the left hand side of* (5.10) *is affected by a time-variant function* $g^{\Delta}(\cdot)$*, while the process* $z^{\varepsilon}(\cdot)$ *on the other side is related simply to a random variable* $g^{\Delta}(\tau)$*. Noting the use of Proposition 4.1, this skill is a key-point of our approach.*

REFERENCES

[1] A. Al-Hussein, *Necessary conditions for optimal control of stochastic evolution equations in hilbert spaces*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization, 63 (2011), pp. 385–400.

[2] A. Bensoussan, *Stochastic maximum principle for distributed parameter systems*, Journal of the Franklin Institute, 315 (1983), pp. 387–406.

[3] V. Borkar and T. Govindan, *Optimal control of semilinear stochastic evolution equations*, Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods & Applications, 23 (1994), pp. 15–35.

[4] P. Chow, *Stochastic partial differential equations*, vol. 11, CRC Press, 2007.

[5] J. Doob, *Stochastic processes*, Wiley, 1953.

[6] K. Du and Q. Meng, *A revisit to* W_2^n*-theory of super-parabolic backward stochastic partial differential equations in* R^d, Stoch. Proc. Appl., 120 (2010), pp. 1996–2015.

[7] ———, *A necessary condition for optimal controls of stochastic evolution equations*, Arxiv preprint arXiv:1206.3649v1, (2012).

[8] M. Fuhrman, Y. Hu, and G. Tessitore, *Stochastic maximum principle for optimal control of spdes*, Arxiv preprint arXiv:1206.2119, (2012).

[9] Y. Hu and S. Peng, *Maximum principle for semilinear stochastic evolution control systems*, Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 33 (1990), pp. 159–180.

[10] N. Krylov and B. Rozovskii, *Stochastic evolution equations*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 16 (1981), pp. 1233–1277.

[11] H. Kushner, *Necessary conditions for continuous parameter stochastic optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Control, 10 (1972), p. 550–565.

[12] Q. Lü and X. Zhang, *General pontryagin-type stochastic maximum principle and backward stochastic evolution equations in infinite dimensions*, preprint, (2012).

[13] N. Mahmudov and M. McKibben, *On backward stochastic evolution equations in hilbert spaces and optimal control*, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications, 67 (2007), pp. 1260–1274.

[14] S. Peng, *A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems*, SIAM Journal on control and optimization, 28 (1990), p. 966–979.

[15] B. Rozovsky, *Stochastic Evolution Systems*, Nauka, Moscow (in Russian-English Translation), 1990.

[16] D. Stroock, *Lectures on topics in stochastic differential equations*, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics, 68.

[17] S. Tang and X. Li, *Maximum principle for optimal control of distributed parameter stochastic systems with random jumps*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, (1993), pp. 867–890.

[18] C. Tudor, *Optimal control for semilinear stochastic evolution equations*, Applied mathematics & optimization, 20 (1989), pp. 319–331.

[19] J. Yong and X. Zhou, *Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*, vol. 43, Springer Verlag, 1999.

[20] X. Zhou, *On the necessary conditions of optimal controls for stochastic partial differential equations*, SIAM J. Cont. Optim, 31 (1993), pp 1462–1478.